

Spring 2-13-1991

Senate Meeting, February 13, 1991

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, February 13, 1991" (1991). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 576.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/576>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

February 13, 1991

Volume XXII, No. 10

Call to Order

Roll Call

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Action Items:

Information Items:

Preface of the Financial and Facility
Status of the Plan for Enrollment
Reduction

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

February 13, 1991

Volume XXII, No. 10

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Len Schmaltz called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center.

ROLL CALL

Secretary Jan Johnson called the roll and declared a quorum present.

Approval of Minutes of January 30, 1991

Senator Mohr: I have a correction on Page 7, Paragraph 6: "Is there an indication that such a financial crisis will come whether the temporary tax increase is made permanent or not?"

XXII-51 Motion to approve the Academic Senate Minutes of January 30, 1991 by Ritt (Second, Nelsen) carried on a voice vote.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Len Schmaltz had no remarks.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson Eric Raucci had no remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Student Body President Terrence Sykes had no remarks.

Administrators' Remarks

President Wallace commented that all universities have had a reduction in this year's budget by 1% of the appropriation. We have had the Vice Presidents doing some preliminary work to get ready to do this. That 1% is being implemented in each Vice Presidential area through the budget areas that report to each Vice President. That is now underway. When we have that completed, we will be able to make some sort of summary

of where those cuts will take place. Obviously, toward the end of the fiscal year, we've got to find the money where we have not already spent it. I think people are prepared for that.

Senator Tuttle: I raise this question without submitting it in writing first because I have had a number of colleagues ask me about it. Since it is an item you have touched on, I am going to go ahead and ask it anyway. A number of faculty in the past week or ten days when they realized that cuts are coming have been asking about the process being used and how it would affect them. Your remarks addressed that a bit. What I said in response to people who have spoken to me, and you might indicate if my statement is correct or not. I told people that I assumed Vice Presidents met with you, among themselves, with the various heads of their units, etc. and that they worked this through in that process. Then the Deans probably met with the Department Chairs and some departments met with faculty and some didn't. The answer to the question that faculty were asking me is: "What has been the role of the faculty in the process?" I wasn't sure I had one. I couldn't say that the Senate Budget Committee had been meeting anywhere in the process. I was merely guessing about the scenario that I just described. I don't know if my scenario is correct. Would you comment on my scenario and the description that I gave my colleagues, and if I haven't been very accurate in my assumptions, you could help me sort it out.

President Wallace: I will make a couple of comments, then the Vice Presidents that are here could address the question if they wish. I would expect that what you outlined is probably correct. I would point out, however, that when you have a budget reduction towards the end of the fiscal year like we have, it is very different than if you are preparing the new budget. For the latter you have time to go through and make cuts where you do the least damage to the University. I would suspect from what I know, and I don't know all of it, that people had to look at their budgets at all levels and if they had vacancies in personnel, they maybe choose to leave these vacant, or postpone equipment purchases till next year, etc. It might be better to take a specific reduction this year because of circumstances.

Senator Strand: Senator Tuttle, the process you have described is accurate as far as the academic area is concerned. I began discussing with the Deans in early January various eventualities in regard to the possible recision in the FY91 budget and possible reduction or reallocation in the FY92 budget. We have discussed various levels of recision or reduction and each dean

has gone back to his or her college and made appropriate arrangements for informing departments and important individuals in administrative positions in their colleges about the possible impact of the reductions. I believe that college by college there has been some variation as to how many people have been involved in these exercises. Furthermore, when I met with the deans last week, because this whole process was extending itself far into the second semester, I gave to the deans some parameters and guidelines which would assist them in a possible recision or budgetary reduction, and they began planning accordingly. On Monday, when the Governor made his announcement which had an impact on the higher education community, I immediately faxed information to the deans and they began to work at that point on the 1% recision. In a meeting with the Deans at 5:00 p.m. this afternoon, we talked about refinements of that process and about strategies by which we could best position ourselves to be prepared for what may be additional reductions that will be forthcoming when the Governor gives his budget address in early March. That is the process that has been utilized.

Vice President Alexander: I think the process that you described is pretty accurate for my areas. I met with my directors and they, depending upon the size of their own areas, talked with those supervisors for necessary input. It is a similar process.

Senator Tuttle: I guess that answers my question. Would it be out of place to ask, we are almost through this process of reducing the budget by 1%, I know we are looking at dire things for next year. We don't know how to act. As I look at the scenario, it doesn't look promising at all for next year. Could I ask if the faculty could have a larger role in this process as we go into this budget cutting task for next year. I am not going to ask to discuss it here. Whether we go through the Budget Committee of the Senate, a selected group of faculty members, or some procedure to provide a more direct role for some segment of faculty as we approach this next round which may be more than 1%.

President Wallace: Certainly. I am willing to say yes. Let me first of all say that I don't think it is too late for the Senate Committees, whether it be the Executive Committee or the Budget and Finance Committee to look at this year's decision because what is in process now is not finalization. I think the Executive Committee could receive that information as soon as it is available. We certainly would be agreeable to that. Regarding next year, I agree with you. As I indicated earlier, next year will be a very different process, as there will be time for getting priorities in focus and starting from scratch. I haven't met with the Vice Presidents yet on this, but

I have been gathering some materials on this process because we know that quite shortly the numbers will begin to unfold for next year. There are some discussions that we need to have at the University Committee levels to talk about what the guidelines might be. I am very interested in having discussion of that and some agreement on the principles.

Senator Mohr: The President alluded to the uncommitted funds that various fiscal units have. Can you reassure the faculty and students that the summer school schedule will be carried out as it has been published, so they can plan their summer on that basis?

President Wallace: I'm not in a position to give you that information. I don't know what the academic vice president is planning. That part of the recommendation will certainly rate attention.

Senator Mohr: I think it would be very helpful for both faculty and students to know what to expect.

Provost Strand: Let me respond briefly. We are very cognizant of our responsibility to the students and also our fiscal responsibility to generate the dollars for the income fund through summer session enrollment. There are a number of factors operating. We must recognize that when we get a recision notice this late in the year, the degrees of freedom which a budgetary unit or area has to respond become very limited. So we balance those limitations against some very strong obligations to try to provide the best summer school offering that we can. In all fairness to you, I will have to say that there will be an impact on the summer session as a result of this recision. There is no way to avoid it. But, we will attempt to minimize that as much as possible with other types of strategies and alternatives. There isn't that much operating budget flexibility when you have an institution of higher education such as Illinois State University, which is so labor-intensive and over 70% of its budget is in the personal service line. It is difficult when you are more than half way through the fiscal year to recover nearly one million dollars without getting into the personal service area.

Senator Zeidenstein: I think you have answered my question at least by inference. When I read the story in the paper, it was unclear. Are we talking about 1% off the total amount budgeted for the current fiscal year, including the amount that is already expended? Or, are we talking about 1% of the remaining unencumbered funds?

President Wallace: We are talking 1% of the total appropriation which is about \$950,000.

Senator Ritt: It was not a uniform cut across the board. There were various cuts per units according to priorities. I would hope that each unit would have a 1% cut, regardless of how those units fit into the University's overall purpose.

Provost Strand: With regard to the academic area, each of the Deans was given a dollar figure as to the amount of recision which would come from that particular college or in the case of the Provost Office, a subdivision of the Provost Office. The Dean is not told nor instructed to apply that across the board with regard to the programmatic units within that college. The Dean has latitude to allocate that reduction within the College as she or he wishes. There are priorities which have been identified both in terms of programmatic priorities as well as budgetary realities.

Chairperson Schmaltz: When does a financial exigency actually kick in?

President Wallace: I would think if we ask the Board of Regents that question, they would have a legal opinion on that. My experience is that it is a very legalistic term and that the administrator does not have the legal right to just arbitrarily impose it. It has a very legalistic meaning in terms of what can and cannot be done with personnel in layoffs, etc.

Senator Ritt: If my memory serves me correctly, neither the Regents or the President can declare a state of financial exigency unless the removal of funds would require the layoff of tenured faculty. Second of all, there is additional protection that there must be full hearings held about whether the declaration of financial exigency is a valid declaration before any processes can start.

Senator Smith: Approximately when will we know about the changes in the summer school schedule. Will there be an increase in tuition?

President Wallace: We will probably know about summer session in a number of weeks. Tuition will not go up at this time.

Senator Raucci: Is it safe to say there will be a lot of cuts in the summer schedule? Are they going to be reducing the amount of classes?

Provost Strand: "A lot of cuts" is subject to a wide interpretation. There will be some reduction. We do not know the exact

magnitude because the Deans have just begun work on that exercise, and they are to turn in to me their reports next Tuesday. These reports will be reviewed by Vice President Alexander's Office. So, we won't know anything until next week and then there will be some additional review of that budget information. I would think that it will be very clear before we break for the Spring recess as to what effect this will have on the summer session.

Senator Raucci: So, the Deans are in charge of what classes will be cut.

Provost Strand: The Deans are making recommendations to me after consultation with Department Chairs about ways in which they can implement the recision. Keep in mind that they are going to try to avoid as much as possible impacting upon the summer session. There is no way that they can avoid completely some budgetary reductions which will have an affect on the summer session.

President Wallace: The good news, Senator Mohr, is that Dr. Alexander is whispering in my ear that there is no way we can afford not to keep the summer session at its current level. So, he is worried about the money. We will have to get all this together before we make a decision. The point he makes is a good one, our funds that we receive from the state are related to what we generate in terms of student credit hours. Whatever the recommendation we do come up with will have to have a balance between revenue and incomes.

Vice President Alexander: That is not saying that we are pre-determining what the Deans have to do. I am saying that the priorities are linked to the discussion and have to reflect that we may be exacerbating the problem if cutting summer school is a primary basis for our solution.

Provost Strand had no remarks.

Vice President for Student Affairs had an excused absence.

Vice President for Business and Finance, James Alexander made a statement in answer to a question from Senator Pam Ritch regarding faculty parking on campus. Senator Ritch asked me to speak to the implications for faculty who park on campus of an article that appeared in the Daily Vidette reporting on a recent meeting of the ISU Parking Committee. The article reports committee action that "defeated the original proposal which granted students a minimum of 10% of parking spaces created by the new decks." The article further accurately reports that

a student member of the parking committee recommended, as a part of a parking spaces allocation plan, a set-aside of all spaces lost to faculty as a result of current building construction that would give these faculty first option on deck spaces. The remaining deck spaces would be allocated to "faculty, staff, and students proportional to demand, with specific space allocations being granted through a lottery system of allocation."

While I believe it is inaccurate to suggest that the committee wasn't considering a number of differing proposals as a result of different presentations (so that saying the committee defeated the 10% proposal may be an overstatement), it is clear that the committee unanimously agreed to set aside spaces lost to faculty as a result of campus construction projects and created a priority system for filling the remainder of the ramps. That priority included first opportunity for persons with reserved permits to move into the ramps, the remaining spaces to be available by lottery to faculty, staff, and students "in proportion to demand." Reserved permit prices would be the same for all users.

The issue of sensitivity is what the phrase "proportion to demand" means in the analysis of spaces left available to faculty, staff, and students in the decks. That issue is to be addressed, along with other general parking enforcement considerations and operational concerns, in future meetings of the Parking Committee. I believe it is appropriate to say that there is a history of past usage on campus among faculty, staff and students. What constitutes a proportional relationship when there are 20,000 potential students and perhaps 3,000 faculty/staff users assumes certain historical information is applied and that certain scale considerations will be made. Exactly what those considerations are will be part of the future deliberations of the Parking Committee. The Parking Committee's recommendations will, in due course, come forward to my office and we will be reviewing the development of appropriate procedures with appropriate university senior staff to assure fairness, equity, and reasonable access for all those wishing to park in university facilities.

The ultimate aim in introducing parking decks was to complement existing parking and to provide options for all categories of parkers within reasonable distances of the building in which they work. What is reasonable will continue to be defined as we integrate the decks into a consolidated parking system. Suffice it to say that over the coming months we plan to work out appropriate details including all enforcement concerns. It is our hope to maximize utilization of parking facilities and to provide a reasonable service to faculty, staff, and student users.

Senator Ritch: We will wait and see what the Parking Committee comes up with.

Senator Johnson: Have there been prices set for those reserved parking spaces?

Vice President Alexander: I read in today's Vidette that Senator Sykes said the prices were very fair. Prices for reserved parking spaces is \$250 and for a non-reserved space in the deck will be \$150. It is my understanding that the Parking Committee is preparing a memo for the entire campus with respect to those interested in reserving places in the parking decks. Those of you interested in reserving spaces will be given a fair opportunity to do so.

No Action Items

Information Item

Preface to the Financial and Facility Status of the Plan for Enrollment Reduction - President Wallace

President Wallace: As you know, we have been talking some time about the enrollment reduction process. We have had people doing some planning. We are beginning a process that I would like to go over with you in the beginning before the presentation as to how as a University we will look at some of the projections and models that have been put together. We will have meetings starting off with tonight with a variety of groups on campus. The Deans have been working with the Vice Presidents and my office in terms of putting together a plan for consideration on campus. Before we take this to the Board of Regents, we felt that this needed to be reviewed by the Administrative/Professional Council, the Civil Service Council, the Academic Senate, student leaders, etc. We will have a presentation to community leaders in the next week or so. We expect by the Spring to take the final plan to the Board of Regents for their consideration. Copies of the plan will be distributed starting tomorrow or Friday. Each of the Senators will receive a copy of the plan, as will the Vice Presidents, Assistant and Associate Vice Presidents, and all of the Chairs of the University. In addition, copies will be available in the Library, and student leaders will also get a copy. What we would like to do is to spend the period of time necessary to have this reviewed so that people understand not only what we are trying to do, but what the implications are for them. Our objective is quite simple. The objective is to bring the facilities and the financial resources of the University in line with our enrollments and our scope of programming. I would like to emphasize that what we are presenting are projections of what

the enrollment and finances should look like as we move from this point to 1995. We are talking about models. We want to try to make sure that people don't view the document as some plan that is set in concrete. These projections that you will see will obviously have to be reviewed on a year-to-year basis and see how we are doing to realize these projections. So, I will be glad to go through this and we can hopefully have some discussion afterwards.

The question that I think is before us as a University has to do with first of all looking at the question of whether we are underfunded or overenrolled. That might seem almost humorous to you. But, I could say that one of the questions when you go to the Board of Higher Education, and you talk to them about what we see as an underfunding, they happen to view as an overenrollment. So, if you take the bottom line on the two sides of the overhead, it seems to be that first of all we have a couple of points to be made. Illinois State University is not unique in terms of being underfunded. But, we are unique in the degree to which we are underfunded in the state. These are comparative data with other institutions: \$9 million dollars; 200 faculty short; and a shortage of 400,000 square feet. These are comparative numbers. This translates to an overenrollment of about 3,700 undergraduates and 264 graduate students. I think then we have to begin to ask some questions. For example, given the realities of state funding for higher education during the last decade, and given the current political climate, what is possible? There are those that say that we should go after the \$9 million dollars, 200 faculty positions, and the 400,000 square feet of space, and therefore we would take care of the overenrollment. I remind you that in the last ten years we have had in higher education in Illinois four years out of that ten that we have had either no salary increments, no operational budget increase, or some negative aspect being applied to our budgets. We are now going into it appears our fifth year out of eleven years. That means that about 50% of the time, we look forward to a budget that is not helping us get ahead, much less make up a deficiency. Therefore, I think that we really need to approach this more from a point of view of what can we do on both sides of the equation. Reality is that we have to decide what our financial strategy is going to be. I think that it is fair to assume that we cannot continue to plan, particularly as we try to implement strategic planning documents in each of the colleges, under current conditions. Strategic planning says that we have a financial strategy to be successful. We also know from experience that if we ask faculty and administrators to do planning and dollars don't follow planning that people don't pay much attention to you the next time that you come by and say, "Let's do some planning." I had the interesting experience as a new

faculty member at another institution going to a faculty meeting in which the President said we are going to do some long range planning. A faculty member who had been around a long time, raised her hand and said, "Mr. President, since I've been here, we've done three long range plans and we haven't implemented any of it, why are we doing another one?" I think the lesson is, that if we don't find a way to find a financial strategy to be successful, that people aren't going to take planning very seriously. They aren't going to have much hope that there is progress in the future to move into new and different programs.

Let's look at some data that we will go over rather quickly, that I think will not be too surprising to you. The enrollment profile since 1985. ISU is roughly at 22,400 students. Going down to 19,400 over a five-year period of time. I will remind you that we get our money from the state based on student credit hours so that there is not a direct correlation. It depends on how many part-time students versus full-time students that you have. I would also point out that in the United States as a whole, the projection for high school graduates is declining in this period leading us up to 1995. I would like to think of this adjustment as focusing on the period of time from 1990-1995 in which we are trying to get parity between our resources and our space and our enrollment. If we can do it means as the profile of our students after 1994 begins to go up if new reserves are available. Until 1995, high school graduation classes are going to provide fewer students going on to College. The ISU enrollment shown, a large increase yearly from about 1983 on, and this is a period of time when obviously we didn't get the resources to match the student population. If we look at a combination of what happened to our number of faculty during the period of this growth, it give you a rather interesting picture. If you take the blue which is the number of faculty you see from about 1981 a decline, leveling off at 1985-86, and then coming back up. Think about this for a minute. If you were to carry that line out to 1995 on the x axis, and you look at a 19,400 enrollment and keep the faculty numbers at about where they are, maybe just up a bit, you could see that we would be at about a 1979 level in terms of the enrollment relative to the number of faculty. So what we are trying to do is to get the number of faculty up and to get the number of students down and we will get to a point about 1995 where we would be at the ratio we had in 1979. Then, hopefully, we could approach letting the University increase again in size, if we had the students and wanted to do that. But with that parity that I referred to earlier and an ability to get new resources would be required to drive that increase in the number of students.

Let me review, because some of you may have missed this,
"Why is ISU unique among all the universities in the state in

terms of our funding?" This give you the per cent change in our appropriation of general revenue (tax dollar) per student over this period of time. You see our percentage base was 29.6% and we can see the other institutions. During this period of time we had the largest increase in the percent of full time equivalent students of 5.5% in the state. So during the time that we had the largest increase in the percent of FTE students, we had the smallest increase in the percentage of tax dollars per student. We also ask the question, "How does this impact on such things as teaching loads?" Here we have the faculty teaching loads in terms of credit hours per staff year, so that is on an annual basis. I assume that is two semesters, so maybe summer school is figured in there somewhere, I am not sure. You see that again we are at 968 relative to other institutions. The state average there is the one that says 750. The state average is 750 and ISU is at 968.

Also, we want to look at the picture of the undergraduate at ISU. I think that as we look at the data and get the feeling that our comparison with institutions such as NIU and SIU is an appropriate comparison.

Let's look at strictly the Faculty/Undergraduate Ratio. We see a 23/1 as compared to other institutions. The point is that when you look at this data, you see that ISU is outside the position of other universities in the state.

Facilities is another part of the problem because it is not just the number of faculty relative to your student body. This is room hours which means both classrooms, laboratories, and everything, all thrown into one. The state average is 25 hours per week per room. ISU has 34 hours. That is the highest in the state. When you break it down into classrooms and laboratories, you see the same sort of thing. This is classroom utilization - 46% for ISU versus 32% at the mean. Laboratories are worse: there is almost a two to one ratio for laboratories. ISU - 30% utilization, highest in Illinois, versus the average being 16%. To give you a bit of feeling for the space deficiencies, this sort of puts it in a perspective that maybe you can identify with. Our space deficiency is Library - 60,000 square feet short; College of Arts and Sciences - shortage; the College of Applied Science and Technology - shortage; relative to Stevenson Hall which is about 100,000 square feet; our total deficit is 400,000 square feet. Our deficit is about four times the size of Stevenson Hall.

What are the outcomes? I want to present outcomes that we would get from the reduction and show some of the financial data that I know students are interested in such as fees. Outcomes in (1) Student Access to Courses, we would hope that we could do some-

thing about the complaint we hear from students about trying to graduate in four years. Trying to graduate in four years is complicated by the increasing need to work to pay the bills, but also the availability of courses. The second one would be to improve the equity of faculty work load relative to other public universities. This obviously also has an impact on our space deficit. If we can do as we are doing now some building -- the Science Building; doing the Student Services Building to free up academic space in the Quad, we can increase our academic space at the same time we are bringing that number for need down by decreasing the enrollment. The morale of faculty and staff was obviously important for no other reason than that they should not be singled out as an institution more than other institutions in the state. It gives us an opportunity to redirect faculty time, space, and budget resources. That assumes that not all of the time that would be freed up by offering some classes less frequently would be absorbed in number one. That would be something that we would have to look at. How is the time that would be saved by faculty not handling the same number of students to be utilized among instruction, research, and service. Number six has to do with improved resources relative to accepted standards of quality and we will spend a little time on that. Let me give you a disclaimer before I do that. Whenever we try to use parameters to link to quality of institutions, we get people arguing about it. I am just presenting the ones that we find used. For example, if you look at the U. S. News and World Report rating of Universities, they use certain standards and certain measures to arrive at their ratings. I am going to use some of those, but I am saying that these measure the quality of the institution, in many cases it measures the quality of the students. Now, keep in mind that these are projections and we are saying if we had 3,000 fewer students; and the removal of 3,000 students was based on trying to get the highest quality student in the profile we now have. Keep in mind on these models and projections are relative to what we have now in terms of resources and student population.) The Freshmen in the top 25% of their high school class, you can see what has happened to that number: 38, 36, 35, and it is projected to go up above 45. That assumes that we are successful in bringing in a quality of student at least equal to what we are doing now. Lowering the undergraduate faculty/student ratio -- about 22.5 to about 19.4. Again, this is projections. The graduation rate, defined as the percent graduating in five years, would change from about 48% to 59%; transfer students -- 63% to 66%. The changes in space for on-campus, non-residential, net assignable square feet for undergraduates on a full-time basis goes up, and that is an appreciable increase: 108.3 NASF to 133.5 NASF.

For the fall of 1990, we started out looking at an enrollment target of 3,500 new Freshmen and 1,800 new Transfer Students. As

we have looked at the pool of transfer and freshmen applicants, we found that we had to do some work in terms of defining the quality parameters for the two pools should be. The quality of the transfer pool relative to the freshman pool is such that we should be increasing the number of transfer students from 1,800 to 2,000; and drop from 3,500 to 2,850 for freshmen. So, what we are trying to do is to get this ratio in terms of the quality of the pool.

Let's then talk a little bit about what happens to the dollars during this period of time. We looked at the quality and other measures. The agreement with the IBHE, and this recommendation for next year was the first implementation point for them. The tuition income that we would lose would be replaced with tax revenue. That manifests itself in the recommendations for next year. By adjusting this year's base budget for ISU by half a million dollars. That is by giving us in the adjustment of the base for this year which is separate from next year's recommendation. That is a very important point because we are not quite sure that much of anything positive is going to happen with next year's budget. So, this year's base has been adjusted and in the process of doing this if the recommendations made by IBHE in total were to take place, we would have made some significant progress on the percentage of our appropriation coming from tax dollars. That's our goal. We have to keep in mind, particularly with the ten year history that I went through with you, that about 50% of the years there isn't any increase in money. There are going to be down years and up years in the future where the IBHE might make these recommendations, but the legislature may not fund them. So we are going to have to look at that year by year so that we maintain a level of revenues to keep us going.

Number two means that when we have a tuition rate increase, that doesn't enter into the calculation done by the IBHE in terms of adjusting our number one. That keeps us from not getting what we feel we should get in terms of equity.

Number three, we know from history relatively how much of the total pie distributed by the legislature, as well as recommended by the IBHE for program and institutional support, that we have been receiving. If you look at the history, we have been getting 7.0%. We are going to make sure that we monitor this so that as they give us more tax revenue to replace the tuition, and that they aren't dropping the amount we would normally get for our program and institutional support. There are other parameters here that we are also monitoring to make sure that we actually do get the increase in tax dollars to support the loss of tuition income. For example, when we put up a new building, we should get a certain amount of dollars per square feet to maintain and operate that building. We feel that we have a way

of monitoring all of this.

Again, in terms of models and projections, what does that do to the general revenue fund, i. e. tax dollars per undergraduate student. In 1988 we had a figure of about \$2,800. That calculation in 1995 is no more than taking the dollars we have in 1990 and reducing 3,000 students and doing the calculations. This doesn't include any projections of what we might get in addition from 1990 to 1995. So this figure is in 1990 dollars. The dollar per student would be significantly higher. This is really what we are trying to base it on.

Let's talk about the fees, because the downside of all of this, particularly in talking with students, is if we have a bond indebtedness for the residence halls that is a fixed dollar figure and you reduce by 3,000 students, that means that the rest of the students would have to pick up the bill. Now we wanted to see what this impact. Let's go through the fees, room and board, and then we will put the fees, room and board, and tuition all together and show you what happens to that figure in 1995.

First of all, fees at ISU have increased on an average of 5.1% over the last four years. That would mean that as we went through our fee processes and students looked at the inflation, new things they would like to do, etc. they have settled pretty much on an increase on the average each year of about 5%. The future annual increases that would be required just to offset the fees lost by a reduction of 3,000 students, over the next five years, would average out to be 3% per year. That is \$6.72 per semester based on 1990-91 cost figures. So, I think you can see where we are leading with this. If we were to maintain the same amount of money as we have in the past, to take care of inflation, assuming inflation was the same over the next five years, and to take care of new initiatives, assuming that was about the same, we roughly would have to add the two together to get to where we would be in terms of the fee increases that the students would see. That means that we are looking at about 8.1% increase in fees. That would be \$19 per semester, based on 1991. What does that do relative to what other institutions are doing with fees. If we take 1990-91, University of Illinois at Champaign, SIU, NIU, and ISU, you will see that we are low on fees and that doesn't include health insurance. You see the percent above the ISU rate. If we take that \$19 per semester and add it to the \$29 dollar figure, you still get \$238 per semester which still keeps us competitive with SIU and NIU. The U of I at Chicago is even more expensive than Champaign.

Let's look at residence halls, because one of the things that obviously has an impact is the room and board. Do we need to

have 13 residence halls? If we didn't need 13 and had to go to 12, would that necessarily be bad news. I don't think that is necessarily bad news, if we can still pay our bills. It is good news in terms of solving potentially some of the academic space problems that we have. Let me point out to you that the tenth day occupancy rate that has been planned by student affairs is 104%, we're suggesting that shouldn't be over 100%. You say that will work against you. It does. We can bring in more revenue by staying at 104%. We feel that programmatically we shouldn't do that. My personal feeling is that on the tenth day, everybody ought to have a room like everybody else. It means that we will have some doubling up for ten days, until some people (and there are always some people who decide they don't want to be here) go home; but on the tenth day I think everyone ought to have a normal living situation. If we did this, we are working against ourselves you might say. Why don't we keep it up to 104%; and get more revenues. This is not a question of revenues. The one at the bottom, number two would help us to pay the bond revenue indebtedness for our residence halls. That is saying that our junior transfer students would reside in a university operated residence for two semesters. Now some people would say that the administration is trying to find a way of getting more revenues so it is going to be requiring juniors to live in the residence halls. In fact, numbers one and two are working in opposite directions. If that was our goal, we would stay in number one at 104% occupancy. I think the decision that we have to make is if we feel that the nature and the quality of the undergraduate experience at ISU is enhanced by the residential experience, which I happen to feel it does, then that becomes an experience that we expect students to have because we think it is of educational value. I personally had the good fortune of going to institutions that were residential, and I have worked at commuter campuses, and I have seen how much students lose by not being a part of a residential environment. So, I think one of the questions that we have in front of us is, do we want to do number two, for two reasons: One, because we believe it is an important ingredient of the undergraduate experience, and two, it does help keep the residence halls filled. We also have to decide on number one, which has a tendency to empty the residence halls. Those are two that I think are important decisions that we have to make.

You will be happy to know that my final slide shows tuition, fees, and room and board all together -- and I gave you some of the dollar values for fees a little earlier. We also know that ISU historically has the lowest rate for room and board in the state, and our tuition has been second in the state only to the University of Illinois. So we put the very low room and board, the relatively low fees, and the very high tuition, all together, and we are less than SIU, NIU, and the

University of Illinois in Champaign. Chicago is 51% higher, it is 35% higher at the U of I in Champaign. So, this is to indicate that from a perspective that: Do we raise our costs so high that we drive away students, I think we can say no. Is it going to cost students more, yes. Where will it cost students more: fees and room and board. We feel that is not a very large increase. Relative to other institutions, the absolute value is there. This gives us a potential to improve the quality of the offerings to students by getting us more in line with space and resources with the rest of the state universities.

You will all receive a copy of this. At the Executive Committee meeting of the Senate, it was decided that they would ask the Senate for a report on this later on. I would be glad to answer questions.

Senator Zeidenstein: In terms of the increase when you have just the student fees alone, you talk about the projected cost of inflation in the future; Projections of the future were extrapolated out of the past increases. Does that translate into saying that additional services or fees, the cost for them, would also be additional services or fees to pay for them. The rate of increase other than for inflation would be part of that future projection.

President Wallace: I would put it like this. Roughly speaking, if you looked at the last five years and said as the students got together they tried to address inflation, put some new money into doing new things, and if you assumed that those variables are somewhat constant over the next five years, then those numbers would be correct. So, there would be room for doing new things and inflation, assuming that those things go at the same rate. That would allow dollars for the same sort of progress as in the past five years.

Senator Zeidenstein: You have two figures there for the rate. You had for 1990-95 a larger percentage of students taking five years to graduate than we have now.

President Wallace: No. That is projecting the percent of students that entered that would graduate -- meaning more success than length of time. In other words we were looking at the success rate for graduation. I'm sorry if that is misleading.

Senator Walker: Your agreement between the IBHE and ISU, are they in writing.

President Wallace: The parameters that we have agreed upon have been put into writing. I think I mentioned to the Senate before

that when we were going through the negotiation, we had a meeting in which the Chancellor, Senator Maitland, Representative Ewing, Representative Ropp and I all got together with Dr. Wagner of the IBHE. We discussed this. We discussed the parameters and what they meant, and then we put on paper the summary of that agreement and all parties have that information. If that is what you call "in writing".

Senator Walker: Did anybody sign it and say they agreed to it, or was it verbal?

President Wallace: It wasn't that formal. We went through it, agreed to what it was, etc. You are just not going to get the Executive Director of the Board of Higher Education to sign a contract with you. I figured with the legislators there, and the Chancellor there, it was a lot better than my going in the room alone with Dr. Wagner. I don't really think that will be a problem. I am more worried about the economy of the state and money being available, because I think Dr. Wagner is working with us. I have seen many things in the past year that have been positive. Not that he has done everything that we have asked. As I have said to a number of people, what is the worst that could happen? The worst that could happen is that we could stay in the relative position on these numbers that we are now. So we could always go back to the situation that we have now, just by letting more students in. When the worst case scenario is about going back to where we are, it is worth the risks that are out there.

Senator Walker: You have predicted a decrease in enrollment of 22,400 total students to 19,400 by 1995. You had an overhead of freshmen vs. transfer enrollment. You showed that we had 3,500 freshmen and 1,800 transfer students in 1990; and in 1995 we would have 2,850 freshmen and 2,000 transfers. That is a difference of 500 a year times four.

President Wallace: That is a ratio that is already being used. That is not a change in the ratio over five years. We have changed those ratios for next fall.

Senator Walker: Five times 500 is 2,500 not 3,000.

Senator Ritt: 500 to 5,000 is a 10% reduction.

President Wallace: I am not sure how that plays in here. One of the things that I know gives us a sizable number was redoing the readmissions policy. I think that was David Strand's area. I think the estimation on the readmission policy was at least another 500 or so per year. They looked at all of those numbers.

Dr. Alexander: These numbers can be confusing. Enrollment management is a very complicated process. One of the things we look at from the start is how many juniors and seniors, and other people you have in the pipeline. What your expectations are from year to year, or how many people will remain. There are attrition rates and a number of other factors that affect the process and the ranges of error to assume. I think that the target that was mentioned was a first-year target with an assumption that some modifications are required. There are a lot of variables regarding students in the pipeline and the adjustment that we make in retention.

President Wallace: Thank you. Regarding numbers of students already in the pipeline, particularly this year's Junior or Senior classes are very large relative to what we now have in Freshman and Sophomores. That was a big factor.

Senator Walker: I have a question on space. You showed where we have less space per student and less usage than other universities. That is good for us. You also showed that we only use it about 36% of the time or 36 hours per week. If I were a taxpayer, I would say why not use the space more. Those figures could backfire on us.

Senator Alexander: If you looked at his chart, it said daytime use. Those are the comparators that the Board of Higher Education have set up. There are a lot of things about use that come into play. Those are standards that are used.

Senator Walker: Was that 36 hours per week, per classroom, not including research labs, or nighttime use.

Senator Alexander: It is 36 hours per week, per classroom. It does not include laboratories. It also does not include nighttime use.

Senator Walker: Wouldn't it enhance our value by putting in nighttime usage?

Senator Alexander: We could. But they don't track that. There is nothing to compare it to. Those are the standards that are used.

President Wallace: That is very difficult. Even if we tried to explain that, I don't think we would make very many converts. I think what we fall back to the equity: Why is ISU so singularly different from everybody else in the state. That is why we use those norms. We get the same thing on faculty teaching loads or the faculty/student ratio. People ask, why can't

a faculty member take care of 30 students? We have a hard time expecting the legislators or the taxpayers to understand. It is very difficult to explain. That is why we fall back on using norms and try to talk about equity.

Senator Walker: I would like to thank President Wallace for bringing this to the Senate. I think this is the type of interaction that we need more of.

Senator Mohr: I have a question about the conversion of residence halls to academic use. Do you have a concrete plan for such a conversion? It seems to me if you do that, that the student fee burden would fall because the University would take over the cost of managing the building, etc. That could lead to reducing the need to have students live on university premises, and solve a space problem. That is a strong option to look at. Do you have a plan.

President Wallace: Yes. This is addressed in the report. In other words, if I remember correctly the feeling was that when you look at the students who want to come into the residence halls, there are some things that are being talked about. For example, could we make the residence halls more attractive to the older students, 25 and 26 year olds. We could have certain residence halls that maybe have features that the others don't have that we could market and attract more of the transfer students into those kind of residence halls. We will try to do that. Once the occupation rate of the residence halls gets to a certain point, then it becomes a question about whether it is worth our while to continue using it as a residence hall. Then what we point out, is that we still have the obligation to pay off that bond so that if academic affairs takes over and we do something different with the building of an academic nature, we are still liable to pay those fees. This would mean that we would have to charge Dr. Strand rent to use it. We have that worked out and it is a matter of seeing how that goes in the next couple of years. That will not be a problem for next fall. Making the residence halls more attractive for different groups is one option. Students who are required to live in the residence halls for the first two years -- we have about 100 that have simply said they are not going to and they don't. We have some ways that we can insure that won't happen anymore. If they are going to be in school, they are going to live in the residence halls. There are some things that have fallen through the cracks and we can tighten up on the policies.

Senator White: I was surprised to hear you so concerned with the transfer students living in the residence halls, especially

when many of the junior transfer students tend to be non-traditional, or a little older. Isn't it going to be sort of counter productive, if we are interested in attracting good older junior transfer students to tell them they have to live in a residence hall?

President Wallace: Could be. That is what we have to test. In other words, we could do something to make it more attractive like saying we will provide a personal computer in each room. We will have to test that out and see what the impact is.

Senator White: Is the need for filling the rooms that critical that we have to make that kind of strategum.

President Wallace: Not necessarily. It depends on what we decide would be the best posture to take.

Senator White: I am confused about the ethical issue, should people live in residence halls. Is that a good experience for them, especially in relationship to transfer students.

President Wallace: We already do that. We require transfers coming in during their sophomore year to live in the residence halls. The question is: do we want to do that for juniors based on the philosophy that it is a good learning experience for students which ought to be a part of the undergraduate experience at ISU.

Senator White: I would think it wouldn't necessarily be a good experience for some non-traditional students.

President Wallace: I am sure that there are some students where that would be true. The thing is that we don't know how many. If it was 25%, then there would be a market there. If 25% of the students did not want to live in the residence halls, it would be one thing, but 75% it is another. How that would work out would depend on when or if we close one of the residence halls.

Provost Strand: The statement on the overlay had two question marks behind it. The information that you saw reflected in that particular statement was prepared by the Student Affairs area, and was one of a number of scenarios by which additional students might be identified to live in a residence hall. From the academic side of the policy, and being responsible for admissions and records and attracting qualified transfer students to campus, we have to be cognizant of whether or not we find that change to be a negative factor that would convince students to go elsewhere rather than come here and be forced to live on campus. We now have to research what the demographics of this junior transfer

population looks like, and probably do some pilot testing as to what students who are here might have done had they been required to live on campus versus the other options that are available. It is something that, as President Wallace said, has to be researched more before it becomes an absolute for housing.

President Wallace: All we are doing is raising the question.

Senator Hall: Would Greek housing still be an option for these transfer students?

President Wallace: We say in the document that we want to protect the Greek system. The Greeks have mortgages just like the University has a bond to pay off for its residence halls, so we are going to work hard to make sure that they will not be affected negatively by this. I would like to say that this is a model, these are projections, and I have taken the point of view from the beginning that part of our solution to our academic problem could well be using some of the residence halls that we now have. We will just have to look at that. There is a lot of tightening up in the system now we could do to require that undergraduates comply with the policies that already exist. We haven't had the problem of getting students into the residence halls, so we haven't kept our policies for freshmen and sophomore housing as tight as we could have. The same way with transfer sophomores.

Senator Zeidenstein: Does a student of any status, freshman, sophomore, transfer, junior, etc. if they have a local residence have to live in a residence hall.

President Wallace: I don't believe they do.

Senator Alexander: I understand that there are waivers given for students who live within a certain radius of campus.

President Wallace: Married students, too. We don't want to split families up.

Chairperson Schmaltz: The Executive Committee have considered this entire matter, and the wish of the Executive Committee was that each committee of the Senate would consider the Enrollment Reduction Plan as outlined this evening by the President and then bring to the floor of the Senate suggested changes in policy statements. The Executive Committee felt that at some point the Senate approve the general outline of the Enrollment Reduction Program. We are advisory to the President, I don't think we have legislative power.

Senator Zeidenstein: From what I saw, it doesn't seem to be so much a plan as to how precisely the enrollment reduction will take place, as the goals and timetables for the effective reduction of enrollment. Weeks and months back I heard a lot of verbiage about the precise ways in which enrollment would be reduced -- the effect on majors, minors, grade point averages, etc. which was sort of farmed out and decentralized. That to me is a plan which committees and senators could review. The precision of how these changes and goals can be effectuated, would be well worth looking at. What we saw here tonight, the structure is fine, but the "how you get there" that is more important as far as senate and faculty input are concerned.

Senator Walker: If we did indeed send this out to committees, are we looking at time line for this Senate, or for the beginning of the next session.

Chairperson Schmaltz: We have only two more meetings for this session: February 27 and March 13. I would think it would be unrealistic to ask for the Senate to act on this. I suppose the next Senate will have to approve it. I would think that any input that the present committees have would be of great value.

Senator Mohr: I understand that we are going to receive a copy of the plan before long?

President Wallace: By Friday.

Senator Mohr: And that plan would include much more detail than tonight's presentation. I think maybe Senator Zeidenstein's question is relevant in the sense that there will be more to chew on than what we have now.

President Wallace: I would suggest that we think about a general direction that we wish to go. It is an outline of the objectives. I think that the most appropriate thing for the Senate to do with this plan is to say that we agree or disagree with the direction and make comments on various policy questions in these documents. The administration could come back every year and update it. Setting enrollments each year is not part of what the Senate does. What the document does is lay out the general direction in which we are going in terms of finances, fees, room and board, etc. It seems to me that it would be appropriate for the Senate to say that this direction is fine. Every year we could update it according to details.

Senator Tuttle: I guess we didn't agree on that then. With only two Senate meetings left, I think the present Senate could still

take a position on the plan. There are general principles involved. If we get into another session of the Senate with new Senators, we will get bogged down and it will be September before we get to it.

Chairperson Schmaltz: We could have a Sense of the Senate Resolution.

Senator Sykes: I would like to see this Senate act on the plan. Senator Zeidenstein said it is important to look at how we get there, but from a student's perspective, it is also very important that we do consider the end results and how student's will be impacted by the fees. If you are talking about over nine million dollars over a five year period, you are talking about a lot of money. We are talking about \$6.72 per semester just to replace the students we are losing. That is going to make a big impact on the entire student population.

Senator Zeidenstein: If we receive copies by Friday, that would give committees two weeks to consider it, and possibly take action at the next Senate meeting.

President Wallace: If committees have questions, the Vice Presidents and I will be happy to attend a meeting to discuss details with them.

Chairperson Schmaltz: At the Executive Committee Meeting of February 4, 1991, there was a motion by Senator Mohr, seconded by Senator Walker: "To furnish all senators a copy of the Plan for Enrollment Reduction, have various committees of the Senate study the plan, and present a resolution concerning the plan at the March 13, 1991, Academic Senate Meeting." Also, as a part of the motion was the plan for the President to present the Preface of the Plan this evening.

No Communications

Committee Reports

Academic Affairs Committee - Senator Walker reported that there will be a meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee on Thursday, February 14, at 4:00 p.m. in Turner Hall 104.

Administrative Affairs Committee - Senator Nelsen reported that he had an Agenda for the committee's meeting on February 25, at 9:00 a.m.

Budget Committee - Senator Mohr called a short meeting of the Budget Committee following Senate adjournment.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Senator Ritt had no report.

Rules Committee - Senator Raucchi announced that his committee could be meeting next week sometime. He will call members.

Student Affairs Committee - Senator Sykes had no report.

Adjournment

XXII-52 Senator Nelsen moved to adjourn (Second, Byers). Motion carried on a voice vote. Meeting of the Academic Senate adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

**FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE
JAN JOHNSON, SECRETARY**

